Message

From: Rowland, Jess [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F726A9239C924C08B38C1A0940CCFD5E-JESS ROWLAND]
Sent: 11/4/2015 7:59:24 PM
To: Sisco, Debby [Sisco.Debby@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

Importance: High

Hi Deb
Here it is
I think the Q & A in blue should be enough
And if u want to condense it...then, the yellow highlight should do it
JR
Jess Rowland,
Deputy Director
Health Effects Division
703-308-2719

From: Housenger, Jack
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:39 PM
To: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Rowland, Jess <Rowland.Jess@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Dix, David" <Dix.David@epa.gov>
> **Date:** November 3, 2015 at 7:22:50 PM EST
> **To:** "Housenger, Jack" <Housenger.Jack@epa.gov>, "Jordan, William" <Jordan.William@epa.gov>
> **Subject: Fwd: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate**
>
> David J. Dix, Ph.D.
> Director, Office of Science Coordination and Policy
> Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
> 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW (7201M)
> Washington DC 20460
>
> Email: dix.david@epa.gov
> Office phone: 202-564-8429
> Location: Room 4126A WJC East
>
> Sent from my iPhone.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: November 3, 2015 at 3:01:38 PM MST
To: "Purchia, Liz" <Purchia.Liz@epa.gov>, "Daguillard, Robert" <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>, "Conger, Nick" <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>, "Strauss, Linda" <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: "Dix, David" <Dix.David@epa.gov>, "Robbins, Jane" <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>, "Wooge, William" <Wooge.William@epa.gov>, "Harrison, Melissa" <Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov>, "Hull, George" <Hull.George@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

I will ask Linda to have a statement ready in case the story gets some bounce. Would a letter to the editor be appropriate?

Catherine C. Milbourn
U.S. EPA HQ
Office of the Administrator
Office of Media Relations
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

From: Purchia, Liz
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 4:28 PM
To: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Conger, Nick <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Robbins, Jane <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>; Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Harrison, Melissa <Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

https://theintercept.com/2015/11/03/epa-used-monsanto-funded-research/

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:20 AM
To: Conger, Nick <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Robbins, Jane <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>; Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Harrison, Melissa <Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov>; Purchia, Liz <Purchia.Liz@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

Hullo Nick

I haven't spoken with the reporter, but I've handled part of her inquiry – keep in mind this is a follow-up. I expect she'll paint the regulatory regime for glyphosate and, perhaps, pesticides in general, as lax and exceedingly friendly to industry. Her questions certainly suggest as much.

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 360-0476 (cel)
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

From: Conger, Nick
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:16 AM
To: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Robbins, Jane <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>; Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Harrison, Melissa <Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov>; Purchia, Liz <Purchia.Liz@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

Thanks Robert. Did you speak with this reporter? The Intercept is Glenn Greenwald's blog and I know they typically looking for stories within stories.

I think these responses are fine, but flagging for Melissa's and Liz's awareness. If you don't hear back from any of us by 11am, please proceed with responding. But if you have any context or insight into her story, let us know.

Nick Conger
Deputy Press Secretary
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 564-6287
Cell: (202) 412-2655

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:46 AM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Conger, Nick <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>
Cc: Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Robbins, Jane <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>; Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: NICK ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: DDL TODAY The Intercept about glyphosate

Thank you, Linda

Nick, for your approval. Please find the questions from reporter Sharon Lerner from The Intercept; and the response, approved by OCSPP's Jim Jones. The reporter's deadline is today AM.

Thanks, R.

I wanted to confirm that glyphosate will NOT be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing.

As stated in the glyphosate Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP) Tier 1 Screening Result document:

"Based on weight of evidence considerations, mammalian or wildlife EDSP Tier 2 testing is not recommended for glyphosate since there was no convincing evidence of potential interaction with the estrogen, androgen or thyroid pathways."

The glyphosate EDSP Weight of Evidence document can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/weight-evidence-edsp-glyphosate

What is the timeframe for the 18 pesticides that will be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing?

EPA is currently finalizing the Information Collection Request (ICR) as mandated by the Paperwork Reduction Act that will allow EPA to issue EDSP Tier 2 Testing orders.

Were the EDC reviews done by a panel? If so, can I see a list of the members for the glyphosate review panel?

The EDSP Tier 1 Screening weight of evidence conclusions were developed internally by EPA scientists and were not reviewed by an external body or panel. The methods and processes by which the EPA developed these determinations have been evaluated by external panels (*e.g.*, FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) and international groups (*e.g.*, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)).

Some have said that EPA's review process, whether for EDC reviews or reregistration of pesticides, favors industry because it relies so heavily on data provided by companies. How do you ensure these processes are fair?"

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, sections 3 and 4), the primary federal law governing the regulation of pesticides, makes clear that EPA shall require the submission of studies from pesticide registration applicants to support registration of pesticide products. Congress placed this obligation on the pesticide registrant rather than requiring taxpayers to fund data development.

To ensure the quality and integrity of data submitted to the agency, EPA regulations set forth good laboratory practices for labs conducting studies that are intended to support applications for registration of pesticide products. EPA's Good Laboratory Practice Standards compliance monitoring program helps ensure the quality and integrity of test data submitted to the Agency in support of a pesticide product registration under FIFRA. EPA also conducts inspections of these laboratories and data audits to monitor compliance.

Once studies are submitted to the agency, EPA scientists analyze the data to ensure that the design of the study is appropriate and that the data have been collected and

analyzed accurately. In addition to registrant-submitted studies, EPA scientists review pesticide studies from peer-reviewed scientific journals and data from a wide variety of sources. Agency scientists identify hazards and characterize risks using the best data available for their review.

How many chemicals have been reviewed through the endocrine screening program thus far?

67 chemicals have been issued EDSP Tier 1 screening orders. As a result, the order recipients of 15 chemicals chose not to develop the screening data (and subsequently withdrew from the market). A status table of the EDSP List 1 orders can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/endocrine-disruption/status-endocrine-disruptor-screening-program-tier-1-test-orders-list-1

The remaining 52 chemicals complied with the issued EDSP Tier 1 orders and submitted the appropriate data. The 52 EDSP Tier 1 Screening Assessments can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/endocrine-disruptor-screening-program-tier-1-assessments

However, we are now using a new approach to screen chemicals faster, cheaper and to reduce animal testing. Over 1,800 chemicals have been partially screened for estrogenic bioactivity based on estrogen receptor model data. More information on the estrogen model can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/endocrine-disruption/use-high-throughput-assays-and-computational-tools-endocrine-disruptor

Have any of those reviews concluded that the chemical in question was an endocrine disruptor?

The determination that a chemical does or is not likely to have potential bioactivity in the endocrine system (*i.e.*, estrogen, androgen, or thyroid hormone pathways) will be made on a Weight of Evidence (WoE) basis, taking into account all available data on the compound including data from the Tier 1 screening assays and other scientifically relevant information.The fact that a substance is bioactive in a hormone pathway based on Tier 1 screening, however, does not mean that when the substance is used, it will cause endocrine disruption or adverse effects in humans or wildlife. The ultimate purpose of the EDSP is to provide information that will allow the Agency to evaluate the risks associated with the use of a chemical and take appropriate steps to mitigate any risks of concern.

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 360-0476 (cel)
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

From: Strauss, Linda
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 7:56 AM
To: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Dix, David <Dix.David@epa.gov>; Robbins, Jane <Robbins.Jane@epa.gov>; Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: LINDA ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: The Intercept about glyphosate

Cathy/Robert, here you go (OKed by Jim).
Bill/Jane, thanks!!

Linda

I wanted to confirm that glyphosate will NOT be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing.

As stated in the glyphosate Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP) Tier 1 Screening Result document:

"Based on weight of evidence considerations, mammalian or wildlife EDSP Tier 2 testing is not recommended for glyphosate since there was no convincing evidence of potential interaction with the estrogen, androgen or thyroid pathways."

The glyphosate EDSP Weight of Evidence document can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/weight-evidence-edsp-glyphosate

What is the timeframe for the 18 pesticides that will be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing?

EPA is currently finalizing the Information Collection Request (ICR) as mandated by the Paperwork Reduction Act that will allow EPA to issue EDSP Tier 2 Testing orders.

Were the EDC reviews done by a panel? If so, can I see a list of the members for the glyphosate review panel?

The EDSP Tier 1 Screening weight of evidence conclusions were developed internally by EPA scientists and were not reviewed by an external body or panel. The methods and processes by which the EPA developed these determinations have been evaluated by external panels (*e.g.*, FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) and international groups (*e.g.*, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)).

Some have said that EPA's review process, whether for EDC reviews or reregistration of pesticides, favors industry because it relies so heavily on

data provided by companies. How do you ensure these processes are fair?"

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA, sections 3 and 4), the primary federal law governing the regulation of pesticides, makes clear that EPA shall require the submission of studies from pesticide registration applicants to support registration of pesticide products. Congress placed this obligation on the pesticide registrant rather than requiring taxpayers to fund data development.

To ensure the quality and integrity of data submitted to the agency, EPA regulations set forth good laboratory practices for labs conducting studies that are intended to support applications for registration of pesticide products. EPA's Good Laboratory Practice Standards compliance monitoring program helps ensure the quality and integrity of test data submitted to the Agency in support of a pesticide product registration under FIFRA. EPA also conducts inspections of these laboratories and data audits to monitor compliance.

Once studies are submitted to the agency, EPA scientists analyze the data to ensure that the design of the study is appropriate and that the data have been collected and analyzed accurately. In addition to registrant-submitted studies, EPA scientists review pesticide studies from peer-reviewed scientific journals and data from a wide variety of sources. Agency scientists identify hazards and characterize risks using the best data available for their review.

How many chemicals have been reviewed through the endocrine screening program thus far?

67 chemicals have been issued EDSP Tier 1 screening orders. As a result, the order recipients of 15 chemicals chose not to develop the screening data (and subsequently withdrew from the market). A status table of the EDSP List 1 orders can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/endocrine-disruption/status-endocrine-disruptor-screening-program-tier-1-test-orders-list-1

The remaining 52 chemicals complied with the issued EDSP Tier 1 orders and submitted the appropriate data. The 52 EDSP Tier 1 Screening Assessments can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/endocrine-disruptor-screening-program-tier-1-assessments

However, we are now using a new approach to screen chemicals faster, cheaper and to reduce animal testing. Over 1,800 chemicals have been partially screened for estrogenic bioactivity based on estrogen receptor model data. More information on the estrogen model can be found here:

http://www2.epa.gov/endocrine-disruption/use-high-throughput-assays-and-computational-tools-endocrine-disruptor

Have any of those reviews concluded that the chemical in question was an endocrine disruptor?

The determination that a chemical does or is not likely to have potential bioactivity in the endocrine system (*i.e.*, estrogen, androgen, or thyroid hormone pathways) will be made on a Weight of Evidence (WoE) basis, taking into account all available data on the compound including data from the Tier 1 screening assays and other scientifically relevant information.The fact that a substance is bioactive in a hormone pathway based on Tier 1 screening, however, does not mean that when the substance is used, it will cause endocrine disruption or adverse effects in humans or wildlife. The ultimate purpose of the EDSP is to provide information that will allow the Agency to evaluate the risks associated with the use of a chemical and take appropriate steps to mitigate any risks of concern.

From: Daguillard, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 2:47 PM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Cc: Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: LINDA ACTION: FOLLOW-UP: The Intercept about glyphosate

Linda, some follow-up questions from Rachel Lerner on Glyphosate. I'm trying to clarify her deadline info.

"I found this page on your site, which was very helpful and answered most of the questions above.

I do have a few other questions, which I've listed below and would love a response to by the end of Thursday, when I'll be filing my piece:

1) I wanted to confirm that glyphosate will NOT be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing.

2) What is the timeframe for the 18 pesticides that will be moving ahead to Tier 2 testing?

3) Were the EDC reviews done by a panel? If so, can I see a list of the members for the glyphosate review panel?

4) Some have said that EPA's review process, whether for EDC reviews or reregistration of pesticides, favors industry because it relies so heavily on data provided by companies. How do you ensure these processes are fair?"

Robert Daguillard
Office of Media Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 360-0476 (cel)
<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2015 3:05 PM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Cc: Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>; Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>; Keltz, Colleen <Keltz.Colleen@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: FOLLOW-UP: The Intercept about glyphosate

Hi,
She has follow up; **DDL: 10/27.**

I have two additional questions relating to the endocrine screening program, and the recently released review of glyphosate in particular. (Here is the document I'm referring to: http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-06/documents/glyphosate-417300_2015-06-29_txr0057175.pdf)

How many chemicals have been reviewed through the endocrine screening program thus far?

Have any of those reviews concluded that the chemical in question was an endocrine disruptor?

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA, Office of Media Relations
Desk: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426

On Oct 23, 2015, at 11:12 AM, Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov> wrote:

Here you go, Enesta.

Linda

From: Strauss, Linda
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 3:58 PM
To: Jones, Jim <Jones.Jim@epa.gov>; Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>; Sterling, Sherry <Sterling.Sherry@epa.gov>; Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>
Subject: Due today - FW: Press inquiry from The Intercept about glyphosate

Question 1: I also have a few questions about the re-registration of glyphosate: What's the time-table? i.e. is there a date when it must be completed?

Response:. EPA will publish the registration review preliminary risk assessments for glyphosate in the next few months for a 60-day public comment period. It will be available in the glyphosate docket (docket #: EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0361)

on regulations.gov. We intend to issue a proposed interim decision for glyphosate in 2016 and an interim final decision in 2017, which will be a comprehensive review of everything except for the endangered species review. The final decision will come after the Services finish their consultation on endangered species.

Background: In the registration review program, the agency is reviewing each registered pesticide every 15 years to determine whether it continues to meet the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) standard for registration. Therefore, if a pesticide was registered in October 2007, it must be reregistered by October 2022.

Question 2: How many studies are being considered in re-registration? And are they all available on regulations.gov or do I need to come to DC to see them?

Response: EPA reviewed a large volume of studies submitted to the agency and drawn from open literature. These studies ranged across a number of areas such as ecotoxicity, ecological fate, human health epidemiology, and cancer. The preliminary risk assessments will include bibliographic information for each study reviewed. The public will be able to search for studies from the open literature by using the listed references. Studies submitted to EPA by registrants are available to the public under the Freedom of Information Act. For information on how to obtain access to those studies, visit: http://www2.epa.gov/foia. In general, EPA's reviews (data evaluation records) of registrants' proprietary glyphosate studies are available via EPA's Chemical Search website: http://iaspub.epa.gov/apex/pesticides/f?p=chemicalsearch:1.

From: Sharon Lerner <fastlerner@gmail.com>
Date: October 19, 2015 at 11:32:57 AM EDT
To: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Press Inquiry about glyphosate

Cathy, I also have a few questions about the re-registration of glyphosate:
First, what's the time-table? i.e. is there a date when it must be completed?
Second, how many studies are being considered in re-registration? And are they all available on regulations.gov?
Thanks so much,
Sharon

On Mon, Oct 19, 2015 at 11:00 AM, Sharon Lerner <fastlerner@gmail.com> wrote:
Yes, thanks, Cathy. I'm looking at it now. Do you know if there's anything available in DC that's not online?

On Oct 19, 2015, at 10:59 AM, Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Sharon,

The docket for glyphosate should be on line. Did you see it in regs.gov?

Catherine C. Milbourn
U.S. EPA HQ
Office of the Administrator
Office of Media Relations
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

From: Sharon Lerner [mailto:fastlerner@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2015 9:44 AM
To: Milbourn, Cathy
Subject: Press Inquiry about glyphosate

Hi Cathy-
I'm writing a story about glyphosate and would like to arrange to come to DC and view the public docket for it. Can you please let me know the soonest date available to do this?
Thanks,
Sharon

Sharon Lerner
Reporter, The Intercept
718-877-5236
@fastlerner

Message

From: Rowland, Jess [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F726A9239C924C08B38C1A0940CCFD5E-JESS ROWLAND]
Sent: 3/16/2015 12:19:22 PM
To: grosse@iarc.fr
Subject: Glyphosate

Importance: High

Hi Yaan

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Can you please send me the final "summary 5.3 for Glyphosate. I don't think I have the most recent version
Thanks

JR
Jess Rowland,
Deputy Director
Health Effects Division
703-308-2719

Message

From: Rowland, Jess [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F726A9239C924C08B38C1A0940CCFD5E-JESS ROWLAND]
Sent: 9/1/2015 12:37:43 AM
To: Akerman, Gregory [Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov]; Kent, Ray [Kent.Ray@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Task 6-148; Acc. No. 251007014; Glyphosate
Attachments: SAP Report.pdf; CPRC II.pdf

HI Ray

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Thanks
JR
Jess Rowland,
Deputy Director
Health Effects Division
703-308-2719

From: Akerman, Gregory
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 7:23 PM
To: Kent, Ray
Cc: Rowland, Jess
Subject: FW: Task 6-148; Acc. No. 251007014; Glyphosate

Hi Ray,

Attached is the new DER for the mouse cancer study for glyphosate --fresh from the contractor. The study report is in Documentum.

Thanks,

Greg

From: edmondsam@aol.com [mailto:edmondsam@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2015 7:20 PM
To: Rowland, Jess
Cc: Brunsman, Lori; Akerman, Gregory; utross1@aol.com
Subject: Task 6-148; Acc. No. 251007014; Glyphosate

Jess,

Please find the files attached for Study report: Acc. No. 251007014 (Task 6-148).

Thanks,
Angie